



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,320	12/29/2000	Andrew Rouse	042846-0313440	6988

909 7590 02/15/2008
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
PAN, YUWEN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/750,320	Applicant(s) ROUSE ET AL.	
	Examiner Yuwen Pan	Art Unit 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21, 22, 24-30, 32-39 and 41-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21, 22, 24-30, 32-39 and 41-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see applicant's Appeal Brief, filed on 12/11/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 21 under 35 USC 102 (e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Ulrich et al (US006052735A).

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 21, 22, 25-30, 32-36, 37-39, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi (US006633759B1) in view of Ulrich et al.

Per claim 21, Kobayashi discloses a method for enabling a wireless client device to communicate with at least one server having one or more applications residing thereon, the method comprising the steps of: enabling the wireless client device (see figure 9 and item 2) to select an application residing on the at least one server (see figure 9 and item 1); enabling the wireless client device to select at least one application action associated with the selected application residing on the at least one server (see column 2 and lines 30-40); executing the at least one selected application action on the at least one server, the application comprising at least one of opening at least one file within the server, closing at least one file within the server, editing at least one file within the server, and searching at least one file within the server (see

Art Unit: 2618

column 2 and line 49-51). Kobayashi does not teach formatting at least one application output associated with the at least one selected application action based on a profile of the wireless client device and a user selection of more fields associated with the at least one file, transmitting the formatted at least one application output to the wireless client device. Unrich teaches formatting at least one application output associated with the at least one selected application action based on a profile of the wireless client device and a user selection of more fields associated with the at least one file, transmitting the formatted at least one application output to the wireless client device (see column 14 and lines 14-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references to properly forward attachment to the destination with compatibility.

Per claim 28, Kobayashi discloses a wireless communication system comprising: at least one server having one or more application thereon (see column 8 and lines 47-51); and at least one wireless client device comprising: at least one wireless client device comprising: a views/folders module that enables the at least one wireless client device to display options associated with a selected application residing on the at least one server (column 9 and lines 40-49); a default and custom actions module that enables the at least one wireless client device to select at least one application action associated with the selected application to be executed on the at least one server, the application action comprising at least one of opening at least one file within the server, closing at least one file within the server, editing at least one file within the server, and searching at least one file within the server; and a forms module that enables the wireless client device to view at least one application output associated with the at least one

Art Unit: 2618

selected application action (see column 10 and lines 52-64). Kobayashi does not teach formatting at least one application output associated with the at least one selected application action based on a profile of the wireless client device and a user selection of more fields associated with the at least one file, transmitting the formatted at least one application output to the wireless client device. Unrich teaches formatting at least one application output associated with the at least one selected application action based on a profile of the wireless client device and a user selection of more fields associated with the at least one file, transmitting the formatted at least one application output to the wireless client device (see column 14 and lines 14-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references to properly forward attachment to the destination with compatibility.

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to independent claims 33 and 38.

Per claims 22, Kobayashi further teaches that the user would be able to select at least one application such as email software (see column 4 and lines 35-38).

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claims 32 and 37.

Per claims 25, 42, Kobayashi further teaches that the feature of the wireless client device comprises at least one of an input interface, a display, and a data processing feature (see figure 1).

Per claim 26, 43, Kobayashi further teaches that formatting the at least one application output comprises at least one of removing an object or artifact contained in the at least one

Art Unit: 2618

application output, and altering the object or artifact contained in the at least one application output to reduce an amount of information that the object or artifact contains (column 10 and line 65-column 11 and line 10).

Per claim 27, 44, Kobayashi further teaches that the wireless client device comprises at least one of a data-capable wireless phone, an interactive pager, or a personal digital assistant (see figure 9).

Per claims 29, 30, 34, 35, 39, Kobayashi further teaches that a customization module that enables the at least one wireless client device to customize at least one view of the at least one application output wherein inherently the customization module further enables the at least one wireless client device to customize at least one of a display language, a time zone, a date format, and a font format (see column 11 and lines 4-23).

4. Claims 24 and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi (US006633759B1) and Ulrich et al in further view of Criss et al (US006308061B1).

Kobayashi does disclose an analogous art as recited in claim 21 and 38, Kobayashi doesn't express teach that the profile of the wireless device comprises at least one of a feature of the wireless client device or a device type of the wireless client device. Criss teaches that the version number, and capacity, etc. of wireless device are transmit to a host computer for keep up with the upgrade of the wireless device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Criss with Kobayashi's

Art Unit: 2618

system to reduce redundancy of upgrade by pre-verifying the feature and capacity of the wireless device.

Conclusion

5. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.


A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yuwen Pan whose telephone number is 571-272-7855. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anderson D. Matthew can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Yuwen Pan
February 12, 2008



MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER